

REMARKS

Applicants' attorney is appreciative of the interview granted by Examiners Mulpuri and Sene on June 23, 2009. At that interview, Applicants' attorney explained why the cited reference to Lee et al did not disclose the two step process of the claimed invention.

Claim 13 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 13, 17-19, 26-28 and 31-33 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Lee et al. In addition, Claims 15-16, 22, 29-30 and 36 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee et al in view of Grolemond, Claims 23-24 and 37-38 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee et al in view of Kleiner, and Claims 14, 20-21, 34-35 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Lee et al in view of Kodas.

At the interview, it was explained by Applicants' attorney that the invention is directed to a two step process for constructing a linear and/or punctiform structure on a support. In the first step, a flowable, electrically conductive paste-like substance containing a solvent is applied to the support.

In the second step recited in Claim 13, after the applying, the substance is contacted with a medium containing a polar molecule, causing the solvent contained in the substance to be extracted therefrom in an edge region, resulting in a hardening and stabilizing of the substance in the edge region.

In the second step recited Claim 27, after the applying, the support is contacted with a medium containing a polar molecule, with forces of adhesion between the medium and the support being greater than forces of adhesion between the substance and the support. In this case, the contacting substantially prevents flowing of the substance along the

support and detachment of the substance from the support.

As explained at the interview, the Lee et al reference discloses a resistive paste for forming an electrically heat generating thick film. While Lee et al does disclose the step of applying that paste to a support, Lee et al does not disclose or suggest the second step of applying a medium containing a polar molecule to the applied paste, or to the support after application of the paste.

Applicants recognize that the paste of Lee et al may contain a surfactant, and this surfactant may be a polar molecule. Nevertheless, as explained above, Lee et al does not disclose the second step of applying a medium containing a polar molecule after application of the paste.

Applicants have discovered that if the polar molecule is applied to the paste, it extracts the solvent from the paste resulting in hardening and stabilizing of edge regions of the paste. Similarly, if the polar molecule is applied to the support, it prevents flowing of the substance along the support and detachment of the substance from the support.

Such a second step is clearly not disclosed or suggested by Lee et al, which teaches that after application to the support, the paste is to be dried by heating.

The remaining references were discussed in the previous Amendment, and none of these references discloses or suggests the second step of applying medium containing a polar molecule to a paste already applied on a support.

Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

Finally, Applicants note that if the rejection over Lee et al is withdrawn at this time, that withdrawal will have been based on amendments and arguments presented in the Amendment filed on November 19, 2008. Accordingly, withdrawal of the finality of the present Office Action would also be appropriate.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks,
Applicants submit that the present application is now in
condition for allowance. An early allowance of the
application with amended claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ira J. Schultz", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ira J. Schultz
Registration No. 28666
Attorney for Applicants
(703)837-9600, ext. 23

Dennison, Schultz & MacDonald
1727 King Street, Suite 105
Alexandria, VA 22314